App. F. IX-4

Previous References

Mez F 35-30-1-2

1935.
(Mezrai)

File No. 134-35

Serial Nos. 1-8

Letter References.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 8

Part B for August-36.

SUBJECT.

Appeal Petition of M/s D Venkataramaiya to allow him to keep the endowment of amount of Rs 9 of Chickmaikara Lakshmi ~~samaradhane~~ ~~days~~ of annual ratho thsava of Sri Prasanna Sri Anjaneyaswamy at the place - able furnishing proper security

No.

To the Mez Comr
" Chief Secy
" Govt (Law) Secretary

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—29 8-36

No 2000-2 of ~~1934-35-8~~
26-8-36

Sanction to the request

AS

Serial No.

Petition of 3.1.35 from Mr. D. Venkata Ramaiya Son of D. Subbaraiya Chettinagaramahalli requesting that he may be permitted to continue to be the Executor of the Will of one Narayana of Chettinagaramahalli making an endowment of Rs 500/-, the interest from which shall annually be used for Sandhana Kaval at the time of the Car festival of Sri Brkhmaphuri Anjaneya Swami of the place under the Circumstances therein.

X 17-

Note to Rs. of 31... that the petitioner desires to furnish Security for the grant that the amount of Rs 500/- (now in deposit) was duly received by him. (now lying in bank)

2) There are some new points urged in the petition which require to be looked into. 1/12

The entire records (relating to the grant and the Trust of the Car Festival) should be sent for further consideration. Sd.

3) The petition may be sent to the C. for report with records.

Received back from Chief Secy on 15/2/35.

15/2

Mucy File No. 12 of 1935

General and Revenue Secretariat

Letter no Hc 984/34-35 dy 19.11.35 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding records relating to the appeal filed by D. Venkataramaiah of Chickanayakanahalli.

D.C's letter no 1742/35-36 dy 7/11/35 regd in the P.W.D is not among the records received from the Muzrai Office but a file on the subject is being sent for the records.

7/11

9 DEC 1935 REVENUE SECTT.

No 782 dy 11.12.1935 from the Muzrai Commissioner calling for additional records —

Letter no Hc 984/34-35 dy 16.12.1935 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding additional records called for.

The temple of Sri Boalmaranga Anjaneyaswamy devaru in Chickanayakanahalli is a Muzrai Institution & it is entered into Devadaya Inam lands measuring 13-32 (both dry & garden lands); these lands are for the service of supplying flowers — (vide Sl no 12 - pp 405 of the Inam Register for ref ce).

11) The Records received from —

12/12

X Q

Serial No.

the M.C. Contain an Extract of a Will as furnished by the petitioner on 3.1.35 = The Will is d. 21.11.1921 & purports to have been executed by one Ranjammma. It is clear from the Will that She has offered a sum of Rs 500/- to Sri R... Muri Anjaneyadevaru, the interest which being utilised for Santharpane on the annual Rathotsavadays of the above deity ——— × × × × × ×

The Control of funds endowed by private persons for the benefit of deities is among Instns. vests with respective Muzr. officers. The true facts of the Case are reported in the M.C's letter No 969/30-31 dt 31.3.1931 & it is after obtaining legal opinion that the M.C's proposal to accept the said sum from the petr was sanctioned by Govt in their order

× × × × × ×

Note—Contn. Sheet.

Mis 285-30-2 & 28/5/31 is against this order the petr D. Venkatanarasaya has filed a review application for a reconsideration of the said order.

2) In para 3 of the Review petition the petr D. Venkatanarasaya says that the said Seshanarasaya (his father) wanted to replace the Car of Sri Anjaneya devaru & that in consultation with the Bhakthas of the temple & with their consent he arranged for the construction of a new car at a cost of Rs 5107- out of the accumulated interest on the capital amount Viz Rs 500/- endowed by the deceased Anjanma - It was the wish of the donor that interest on the sum should be utilised for Sambhavane & not for any other purpose & on the Rathotsava day it as such the utilisation of the sum for the construction of a new car by petr & his father has not been treated as a deviation from the purpose for which it was intended by the donor

3) It is seen from the evidence of the wife that Pranesacharya Venkatacharya Bhatta of Chickmagalur taluk & Dakshinamurthy Bhattacharya Seshanarasaya should receive the sum of Rs 500/- from the borrower Viz Huliyar Linganna & hence

Re: recovery of endowment amount of Nanjamma — Chickmagalandaram

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 193 . — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

for perpetual the Endowment of Santharpane once a year from out of the interest on the said sum; the deed has not created a hereditary trustee right so as to create a right in favour of the petr who is his father's demise — The trustee ship ceased with the deceased father viz Sithanaiya — In these circumstances the contention of the petr to have any thing to do in future with the endowment of Nanjamma is not tenable & the need for a modification of the Govt order no. 2563-65/Rev 285-36 of 28/5/31 does not also arise as prayed for by the petitioner — The file may however be referred to Law Secy for favour of remarks in respect of para 7 of the P.O. wherein the petr says that intervention of Govt in this case is not called for. The petr is not himself a trustee appointed either by the donor or by any of the officers of the Revenue Depn. Govt Rules for orders — The petr has not sought to be heard before on.

Yes 29/2

GS 19.2.36

On his

13) The money was left by Nanjamma for charitable purposes in the hands of the executors of her will appointed for

X

Norm.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03591—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

the amount left for ~~absent~~ Santharpane, viz., Puranikam Venkatesh Bhatta and Babbeghatta Sitharamiah. There is nothing in the will to show that they were appointed as trustees of the fund. The money does not therefore belong to D. Venkataramiah. Nor is he one of the executors of ~~the~~ Nanjamma's will. But the money came into his hands ~~along with his father's property~~ as the jewels on the security of which they were lent came in his hands along with his father's property. It is a point for consideration whether he has any right to keep it for being used for santharpane as contended by him. The Law section may be consulted on this point.

Regulation ~~section~~ section 18 of the Rel. and char. Endowments authorizes Govt. to undertake the management of such property when it is mismanaged. But the petitioner contends that there has been no mismanagement and that Govt. have no right to interfere since there has been no mismanagement. He has used the interest on the money, the bulk of which had remained unexpended as the Utsava Vigraha was stolen and the Rathotsava was consequently stopped. Owing to the stoppage of the Rathotsava he could

5404/35
P

Serial No.

not spend the money for ~~Rathotsava~~ Seethaparam on the Rathotsava day; since the petitioner used it for ~~charitable purposes~~ constructing a new car for the temple ~~for~~ getting a new Utsava Vigraha made and repairing the temple, he seems to contend that he cannot be said to have misappropriated it ~~and~~ since he did not appropriate it for his own use and that there has been therefore no mismanagement; the petitioner's request that Govt. should not take possession of the money is therefore a point for orders.

(2) With a view to ensure that the heirs do not misappropriate the money, it would seem to be necessary to obtain security from him if he wishes to continue as sole ~~trustee~~ of the fund. But D. Venkata ramiah was unwilling to give security. That is one of the reasons why Govt. decided to obtain possession of the money in G. O. No. 2566-65 Mug-285-30-2 dated 28th May 1931. But he states now that he is willing to give security.

(3) For favr.

D

26.2.36.

Law Secy
Law Secretary
With Compliments

Law 1004 29/2

29/2

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7-35

Mus File No. of 1935. General and Revenue Secretariat

The merits of this Case have been fully discussed in the legal opinion recorded in Mus 285-30 Sl 12 placed below (vide page 2-5 of the note)

17) In para 7 of the appeal petn., it is contended that Govt is not a party to the arrangement contemplated in the will, and consequently their interference is not called for. This appears to be the only fresh point now urged for consideration. A Copy of the will is available in the records. 'X'
From a perusal of the same it can be seen that the endowment was given to the Temple which is a Mus. instn and that the two individuals named there in were requested to carry on the annual Sandalpane from the income that can be received from the endowed amount. Interference of Govt for better management of a Mus. instn is therefore well founded, and the petitioner's claim is untenable. Moreover it was open to an aggrieved party to file a suit in the Court as against any order passed under sec 18, cl (2) of Regn III of 27, within 6 months from the date of the order. no such action has been taken by the petr since 1931. His claim is therefore barred by time.

216
Law.

TSD 12/3

18) Is this an appeal to Govt? If so under what section and against which order of the Mus Comr?

pool 12/3/36

Serial No.

D'

1) Thru is a petn praying for reconsideration of the S.O. no. 2563-65 Mug. 185-30m d 28.5.31

TSD 13/3

There is no provision of law under which this petition can be entertained The petitioner has ample remedies under the Mun Regn which for reasons best known to himself he appears disinclined to pursue.

~~It prays in addition~~

2) The reconsideration is an incidental prayer. The final para mentions Sec 39 & asks for modification of the Mun Officer's orders, evidently passed under Sec 18 after sanction of Govt was accorded in GO of 28/5/31 - which is this order & when was it passed?

DRP

2) Kind reference is invited to Mug 7 On the enquiry report subd. by the S.D.O. on 19.12.33 the DC Tumkur has added, "that the money must be secured and that neither security nor mortgage Can be Considered" ~~addl~~ ~~accepted~~ ~~disagreed~~

TSD 14/3

22) The petition

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 05091—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

under sec 39 of Regulation VII of 1927, is hopelessly belated and has to be rejected on this account. The petitioner had ample remedies under the Regulation to have the matter settled in a proper Court of law. For reasons best known to him he has not chosen to pursue those remedies. The petition discloses no case for reconsideration of orders already passed and may therefore be rejected.

Asst Secy mvr
With Compts } MVR 14/3/36

2) The facts of the case are as detailed at paras 9 to 12 of the office notes from pages 2 to 5. The Law Asst Secy's opinion above is for personal. His opinion may perhaps be accepted and the petn rejected.

JV 14/3/36

Gen: Secy 3) strictly speaking and on merits there is no reason to consider the present application. Petitioner admits that he holds the amount for the Temple and for the

RECEIVED 14 MAR 1936

Serial No.

purpose mentioned by the testatrix. It is open to Govt to get the amt deposited safely from him & set and arrange for the seva. The order already passed may thus stand unmodified

2) That order however was passed on the report that the petitioner refused to give security for the due performance of the seva. He now offers to give security.

3) If he does give adequate security it may be desirable to let him arrange for the seva. If a person like this does such do so the local officers would have to find someone and a Sanitarian paraded so conducted is likely to be worse than one conducted by a private person.

4) In this view the D.C. may perhaps be asked to enquire if the local officers consider it desirable to let the man keep the money, give security for due performance of seva and carry it out & give accounts.

17/2

2/7/13

Asst Member

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

17 JUL 1936

29) Draft as in paras 24 to 28 supra dtd

GS 25/3 25.3.36

30) Draft as revised & 26/3/36

No 1384 dy 28/3/36 to the Muzrai Commissioner Calling for a further report.

Letter no HE 98/34-35 dy 22.7.1936 from the Muzrai Commissioner requesting approval to the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur to that for accepting the Security offered by Mr D Venkatarangaiya and allowing him to keep the Pudhval amount with him subject to conditions specified therein.

31) The report received is dated with reference to paras 26 — 28 supra. It is stated that the Security proposed to be given for the amount in possession of D. Venkatarangaiya should be free from all encumbrances and a certificate to this effect is necessary before Sanction is accorded to the proposal.

32) Submit for orders —

GS 31/3/36 31.3.36

26 MAR 1936

Draft 28/3

30/3

Re: The Endowments of Nanjanmar in possession of D. Venkatasamaiah for Services in Sri Rajarajeswara Swami Temple

Serial No.

33) Both the Amildar and the Sub Dr Officer say that the encumbrance certificate will be got from the party after final orders are passed. The Murrai Commr also support this proposal and adds that on receipt of orders, he would instruct the Dy. Commr to get the certificate from the party and then get the mortgage deed registered. The proposal may be approved.

Gen. Secy) Dec 1918

34) Reference orders in para 28 above Sec'y The Murr. Commr thinks that the arrangement proposed is suitable and may be sanctd. The fact that the land offered as security is free from encumbrance will be verified after approval & the proposal is communicated & agreement would have to be taken from the party and got registered that later encumbrance also may not imperil Govt's hold on the security. The proposal was approved,



First Member 35)

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

File No. 134 of 1935

General and Revenue Secretariat

Issue
dt
24/8/36.

G.O No 300-2 dy 26-8-1936 8
Sanctioning the recommendation of the
Mizo Commission in pl 7.

B
3/9/5/9

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

To.

The Chief Secretary,

To the Government of his Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E

Mys 134-35-1

By Hand Post

Petitioner:- D.Venkataramiah, son of D.Seetharamiah,
resident of Chikanayakanahalli, Tumkur Dt.

The petitioner begs to state as follows:-

1. One Nanjamma of Chikanayakanahalli executed a Will on 21-11-1901. In that Will there is a direction that a sum of Rs 500/- which was due to her from one Linganniah on a pledge of some ornments, should be recovered from him and that the interest on the said amount should be utilised for Santharpane at the time of the Car Festival of the Sree Bramhapuri Anjaneyaswamy of Chikanayakanahalli, every year. She appointed as executors for this purpose one Venkatesabhatta and another Seetharamiah of Chikanayakanahalli. Of these two persons, Venkatesabhatta died and Seetharamih, the surviving executor and the deceaded father of the petitioner, recovered the said amount from the said Linganiah and went on carrying on the Santharpane according to the directions in the Will from the vear 1901 upto the year1915, without any break.

2. In the year 1915, unfortunately the car of the Diety broke down. Neither the Bhaktas nor the Government made arrangements to Have it repaired or replaced and hence there was no car festival conducted. Besides, just at this time, the Uthsava Moorthy of the temple, was also stolen away. Although there was no car festival, yet in order to carry out the wishes of the testatrix, the deceaded Seetharamiah and afterwards the petitioner were carrying on the Santharpane on a small scale as there was no congregation of many of

of the devotees since there was no car festival.

3. Subsequently, the said Seetharamiah wanted to replace the car as the old car had become unserviceable, and he therefore arranged in consultation with the Bhaktas of the temple and with their consent, for the construction of a new car at a cost of about Rs 510/- out of the accumulated interest on the capital amount.

4. In the meantime, the said Seetharamiah died and his son petitioner continued the work of getting the car prepared, which is now ready and is in use since 1931, and the said Santharpane is also carried out on a large scale.

5. In the year 1929, on some audit objection being raised about this amount, the petitioner was called upon to execute a bond for the said amount hypothecating his properties. The said report of the auditor is based on a misconception that Seetharamiah the petitioner's father and the executer of the Will had borrowed a sum of Rs 500/- and had executed a pronote, which is absolutely false, as the said Seetharamiah had not borrowed any money from the temple funds, but was only a Trustee. The petitioner gave a statement to the effect that he would not execute any hypothecation bond as it was not a debt borrowed by his father from the temple funds, but that he was ready and willing to carry out the intention of the testetrix and that he would execute a muchalika for the due performance of the Santharpane.

6. The matter went up before the Muzrai Commissioner and on his recommendation, Government have passed orders in Order No.12563-65. Muz.285-30-2, dated28-5-1931 to the effect that action should

should be taken under Section 18 (2) of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation VII of 1927 for the recovery of the Puduvat amount together with the accrued interest and that the amount recovered from the petitioner should be kept in the Savings Bank Fixed Deposit for the benefit of the Institution, on the ground that the applicant declined to furnish any security for the amount.

7. The petitioner has herewith enclosed a copy of the will of the testatrix for favour of perusal, It is seen from the will that it is a voluntary agreement entered into by private individuals as between them, the disposal of the principle being left entirely to the discretion of the executors. The only condition required is that the interest should be utilised for the Santharpane on a particular occasion, when it happens. It is thus clear that Government officers are not parties to this transaction and redress is not claimed either by the donor or the donee. The petitioner therefore humbly begs to submit that under Chapter IV Sec1 (b) of the Muzroi Manual (page 270) interference of Government is not called for in this case, as Government officers were not parties to the arrangement, it being laid down that redress must as a rule be sought by the parties who would consider themselves entitled thereto at their own instance and not through Government.

8. In the second place, the petitioner begs to submit that the Seva was being performed regularly on large scale as usual until it became impossible of performance on account of the theft of the Uthsava Moorthy and the break-down of the car. There is no omission on the part of the said Seetharamiah or his son the petitioner. In fact, the said Seetharamiah and his son, the petitioner

petitioner got a new car prepared out of this fund and also got a new Uthsava Murthy and since the year 1931, the car festival is being celebrated and the Santharpane is also being performed according to the wishes of the testatrix.

9. For these reasons, the petitioner humbly submits that this case does not fall within the purview of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation VII of 1927.

10. In the belief that this case was not governed by the said Regulation and also for the reason that the amount was not a sum borrowed from the temple funds, the petitioner made a statement before the Deputy Commissioner on 21-4-1930, that he was not willing to furnish security and it is for this reason that action is ordered by Government, to be taken under Section 18 of the said Regulation.

11. According to Sec 18 of the said Regulation, action can be taken only if it is proved that there has been gross mismanagement of any property pertaining to any institution or any misapplication or misappropriation of any part of the property or any breach of trust, in respect thereof. In the present circumstances, the petitioner begs to submit that none of these acts are either alleged or proved, the cessation of Santharpane on a large scale, being due to the non-perfomance of the Car Festival for reasons beyond the control of the deceased Seetharamiah the father of the petitioner.

12. Even if it is held that the said section applies to this case, the petitioner begs to submit that in the said section alternative provisions have been made and as per clause (3) the Muzroi Officer, may, with the previous sanction of Government obtain security for the proper performance of the trust or

or management of the property.

13. Before a reference is made ~~xx~~ to Government to obtain sanction under Section 18 of the said Regulation, an enquiry regarding the mismanagement has to be held and it is only in cases where there is proof of mismanagement, that the Muzroi Officer may proceed under Section 18. The petitioner begs to submit that there has been no enquiry as contemplated by Section 37 of the said Regulation before the Muzroi Officer sought for the sanction of Government for proceeding under Section 18. After orders of Government were obtained to proceed under Section 18, the Muzroi Officer has passed orders on 15-6-1931 that an enquiry under Section 17 should be held. Consequent on this, an enquiry was held and even though no mismanagement of the temple property was disclosed or even alleged, the petitioner came forward and offered to give security and the learned Muzroi Officer has neither accept the security nor proceeded to obtain orders of Government after he has proceeded to hold an enquiry under Section 17 of the said Regulation.

14. The amount stated to be in the hands of the petitioner all along, is not correct. The petitioner has spent certain sums now and then for the purposes of the temple as disclosed in the statement made by him before the Gubbi Sub-Division Officer and the Muzroi Officer and the amount now remaining in the hands of the petitioner is only Rs.500/- and odd for which he has maintained proper accounts which may be called for and scrutinised at any moment.

15. Government have ordered action to be taken under Section 18 (2) of the said Regulation on the ground that the petitioner did not offer security. That subsequently, at the time of the enquiry held

neld under Section 17, the petitioner in his statemement before the Gubbi Sub-Division Officer on 20-7-1931, has definitely stated that he is ready and willing to furnish security. The offer was accepted by the said Officer. Subsequently, the Muzroi Officer has ordered that this cannot be done.

16. The petitioner humbly begs to pray that Government may kindly be pleased to reconsider the order passed in Order No. A Dis 261/30-31 12563-65. Muz.-285-30-2, dated 28-5-1931, referred to above, for the reasons mentioned above and hold that the submission of the petitioner that the facts of the case are not covered by Section 18 of the said Regulation. is correct; and even if Government are not pleased to do so, atleast to order that the petitioner might continue to be the executor of the Will, after furnishing proper security for the amount and to carry out the wishes of the testatrix, as he has been doing all along.

17. The petitioner humbly begs to submit that on account of the irregularities of procedure detailed above, grave miscarriage of justice has resulted to him, as he was deprived of the chance of furnishing the security at the time prescribed by the said Regulation and he therefore prays that Government be pleased under Section 39 of the said Regulation, to call for and examine the entire records of the case and modify the order of the Muzroi Officer and do justice to the petitioner.

D. Venkatarao

Chikanayakanahalli. *
*
Dated, 3rd January 1935. *

Memo 1111, dated
Forwarded with Compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner
for favour of report together with Records
22. FEB. 1935 in B.C. No.
Received with the Case.
By order
for Chief Secretary

M-G 181 HC 98/34-35
No. .....
Enc. file

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 16th November ..... *193* 5.

19

GENL. & REV. SECRETT. 567 21. NOV. 1935 MUZRAI

FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Mug 134-35-3

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., I. A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

20 NOV

SIR,

Recovery of endowment amount of Nanjamma of Chicknaikanahalli.

With reference to the Chief Secretary's Memo No.1116 dated 21st February 1935 calling for a report with records on the appeal petition of D. Venkataramiah on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith the file of vernacular records received with Tumkur District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.1242/35-36 dated 5th November 1935 and to state that the facts of the case are explained in this office letter No.969/30-31 dated 31st March 1931 addressed to the Financial Secretary to Government and the Government Advocate's opinion furnished thereon enclosed in this office file No.D1 Dis.261/30-31 sent herewith.

M-Mug 285-30-2

The appeal petition is returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 11th December 1935

No. 782/Rev (34-35=6

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.H.C.98/34-35 dated 19th November 1935 forwarding records about the recovery of endowment amount of Nanjamma of Chicknaikanahalli, I am directed to request you to be so good as to forward copy of Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's letter No.1242/35-36 dated 5th November 1935 together with your -- office file on the subject as the same is not among the records received with your letter under advertence.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

General Secretary to Government.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section

File No. 134-35

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No 782

To

The Hon'ble

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

he *193*

Sir,

With reference your letter

Date of issue 11-12-35

No HE 98/34-35 dt. 17.11.35

forwarding reports about the

Signed by Mr. B. Muddaiah

Secretary

recovery of enhanced annual

demand of Rs. 1,00,000 of Chickanayakanahalli

Agly.

request you to be so good as to

Taluk. I am directed to forward

herewith copy of Tumkur D.C.'s

letter No. 1202/35-36 dt. 5/12/35

together with your office

List of enclosures .....

file on the subject as per

above and to say

Copied by .....

that necessity for issuing

notice in your letter

ned by .....

dated 11

1 x file

Bangalore, 14th Dec 1935

76

GENL. & EMERGENCY BRANCH
8 JAN 1936

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N MADHAVA RAU, ESQ, B A, B L~~,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore

M443 134-35-5

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., I.A.S.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department*

GENERAL
16 DEC 1935

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.782/Muz.134-35-4 dated 1-12-1935 re. recovery of endowment amount of Nanjèr ... of Chicknaikanahalli, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of Tumkur District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.M.12 36 dated 5-11-1935 together with this office file No.D1 Dis.26 of 30-31.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K V Ananta Raman
Muzrai Commissioner.

From e Deputy Commissioner,
s rict, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:- Recovery of puduvat loan from Mr. D. Venkataramaiah of Chiknaikanahalli.

With reference to your Memo No.H.C.98/34-35 dated 6-3-1935 calling for the submission of a report in the matter together with the connected file of papers on the above subject, I have the honor to submit the same herein enclosed for favour of perusal. This office file No.L.Dis.M.3639/32-33 containing the facts of the case is also herewith sent. The petition of Mr. D. Venkataramaih and its enclosure presented before the Chief Secretar to the Govt. of Mysore on 5-1-1935 accompany.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSOR

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mustaqui for 1348

2 k

No. 1384/Muz. 134-35-6 Dated, Bangalore, 27 th March 1936

Bangalore

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. M.C. 98/34-35 dated 16th/December 1935 submitting additional records about the recovery of Puduvat endowment of Rs.500 given by one Nanjamma of Chicknayakanahalli, the interest on which is intended to be utilised for a santharpane on the annual Rathotsava of Sri Brahmapuri Anjaneyadevaru in Chicknayakanahalli I am directed to forward herewith petition of one Mr.D. Venkataramaih, son of D. Sitaramaiya in the matter and to enquire in view of the fact that the petitioner who originally refused to give security for the due performance of the seva now offers to give security, if the local officers consider it desirable to let the petitioner keep the money, give security for due performance of the seva to carry it out and give accounts. The entire records received from you are herewith returned for resubmission with your report. The petition also may kindly be returned with your reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

General Secretary to Government.

G.S

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mez

File No. 134-35

Serial No. 6

3 Encls

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 1348

Enclosures

To

The M. C.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with Govt. Junction No. HC 98/34-35 dt. 16/12/1935 submitting additional records about the recovery of ~~a sum of~~ Rs. 500 ~~endowment~~ ~~by~~ ~~Rs.~~ ~~500~~ given by one ~~of~~ Ranganna of Chickaraya-halli, the interest whereof is intended to be utilised for ~~holding~~ a Sankaranane on the annual Rathotsava of Sri Brahmashri Anjaneyaswamy in Chickarayakanahalli, I am

Date of issue 28-3-1936

Signed by Mr. R. Siddakrishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

WD 01956—GPB—22,590—12-6-34

directed to forward hereunto petn of one
Mr D. Venkataramaiah Sangd.
Srikantaraiah in the matter of & to State enquire Distct to know
of the fact that the petr has origin
That Strictly speaking for ally to give security for the per-
Merits there is no reason formance of the Sevas now offer
to give security, if the local officers
Consider the present application appealing against
orders passed in G.O. No. 2563-65 dated 28 today regd. on
Mr petitioner admits that he
on behalf of
Has the sum for the temple
for the purpose mentioned
by the testatrix. It is open to Govt.
to get the amount from him, and
if not it desires safely and to
& arrange for the Seva.
The order already passed in
the matter may therefore stand
as modified. The order however
does not in the report
that the petr refused to give
Security for the due
performance of the Seva.
He now offers to give Security.
If the petr gives adequate
Security it is desirable to permit

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*

undertake the performance of the Sera

him Arrange for the Sera and that if a person this does not do to the local Officers will have to find Someone and a Sauthampton to conduct is likely to be worse than the one Conducted by a private person - In this view I am to request you will be pleased to [illegible] of the Loc. [illegible] Consider it desirable [illegible] the [illegible] give Notice, [illegible] Order [illegible] to Carry [illegible] and you [illegible] the entire Records [illegible] are herewith returned for Submit with your report - The petitions may be returned with reps. I have Etc

Yr Govt

GV

273

WD 0186—GPB—15,000 -6-9 34

Mey 34-35-7 30

M (713.) No. He 98 34-5

Enc. 1 & file

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 22nd July *193 6*

22



FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

SIR,

Recovery of the endowment amount of one Mrs. Nanjamma of Chicknaikanahalli.

With reference to your letter No.1384/Muz.154-35-6 dated 28th March 1936 on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of Tumkur District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.F.1242/35-36 dated 11-7-1936 together with the connected file of records, reporting that Mr. D. Venkataramiah has offered S.No.247 (garden) of Dabbeghatta village measuring 7 acres 9 guntas assessed at Rs 29 and estimated to be worth about Rs 4,000 as security for the proper conduct of the santarpan stipulated by the donor. The Deputy Commissioner recommends that the security offered may be accepted and Mr. D. Venkataramiah allowed to ~~xx~~ keep the puduvat amount with him and perform the seva, subject to the condition of furnishing a statement of accounts within a month after th conduct of the seva. The Dharmadarsis of the temple are also agreeable to the proposal. In these circumstances, I request that approval of Government to the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation may be obtained. On receipt of orders, the Deputy Commissioner will be requested to get an encumbrance certificate from the party and get the mortgage deed registered at the cost of Mr. Venkataramiah.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
M. N. Anantaraman 22-7-36
Assistant Commissioner
For Muzrai Commissioner.
(Absent from Headquarters)

Letter No.M.1242/35-36 dated 11-7-36 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, to the Huzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:- Acceptance of security for the puduvat amount offered by Nanjamma for the performance of Santarpane on the Rathotsavam Day of Sri Lakshmapuri Anjaneyaswami temple at Chiknaikanahalli.

With reference to your Memo No.H.C.38/34-35 dated 14-4-36 on the above subject, I have the honor to state that Mr. D. Venkataramiah who has got the puduvat amount with him has offered the marginally noted land as security for the due performance of Santa pane in accordance with the wishes of the donor. The property is stated to cost about Rs 4000 and the Dharmadarsis of the temple have no objection to accept the security. The Amildar and the Gubbi Sub Division Officer have stated that the question of acceptance of the security may be favourably considered. In these circumstances, the security offered may be kindly accepted and the petitioner allowed to keep the puduvat amount with him subject to the conditions that he performs the Santarpane on the Rathotsavam Day and furnishes accounts of expenditure incurred within a month afterwards. The question as to how the puduvat interest should be spent in case there should be no Rathotsavam for want of a car is being investigated. The connected file of papers on the above subject ending with Gubbi Sub Division Officer's No. A1-C.1751/34-35 dated 2-5-36 is herein enclosed for favour of perusal.

S.No.247 Garden 7 acres 9 guntas in extent and assessed at Rs 29.	:

"C O P Y"

M N Ramaiah

For Huzrai Commissioner.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore.

...

R e a d:

G.O.No.2563-65/Muz.285-30-2 dated 28th May 1931 sanctioning the recovery of the Puduvat amount endowed by Mrs.Nanjunma of Chickmayakanahalli together with the accrued interest thereon from D.Venkataramaiya and its acceptance as an endowment to be kept in Government Savings Bank deposit for the performance of santharpane on the day of the annual rathotsava of Sri Brahmapuri Anjaneyaswami at the place.

2. Petition dated 3rd January 1935 from Mr.D.Venkataramaiya appealing against the order read above and requesting that he may be allowed to keep the amount with him and carry out the wishes of Mrs.Nanjamma after furnishing proper security for the same.

3. Correspondence ending with letter No.H.C.98/54-35 dated 22 d July 1936 from the Muzrai Commissioner furnishing his opinion in the matter.

Order No. 300-2/Muz 134-35-8 Dated Bangalore 25th August 1936.

It is reported that Mr.D.Venkataramaiya has offered S.No.247 (garden) of Dabbaghatta village measuring 7 acres 9 guntas assessed at Rs.29 and estimated to cost about Rs.4000 as security for the proper conduct of the Santarpane stipulated by the donor. The Deputy Commissioner has after consulting the Dharmadarsis of the temple recommended that the security offered may be accepted and that Mr.Venkataramaiya may be allowed to keep the Puduvat amount with him and perform the seva subject to a statement of accounts being furnished by him within a month after the conduct of the seva. The Muzrai Commissioner supports this recommendation and adds that on receipt of orders the Deputy Commissioner will be requested to get the necessary certificate from the party showing that the land offered to be given as security is free from encumbrances and get the mortgage deed registered of the party. Government are pleased to sanction tion of the Muzrai Commissioner.

For General Secretary

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore with [illegible]
The Comptroller to Government.
The Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District.

TSS

G. R. S. App. F VI—G 2]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Writs

Diary. No. of letter replied to.....

Section Mis 3

File No. 134-35

Serial No. 8

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue 26-8- ...193 6

Signed by Mr D. C. Subbaraya Iyer

Read— Lr no 2563-651 Mis 3 28-30-28, 28, 1/12-1 Sanctioning the recovery of the Peshkash due and ordered by Mrs. Nanjamma of Chikmagalur Mahalli together with the accrued interest thereon

Order thereon—No. from Sri D Venkataramaiah and its acceptance as an endowment (to be kept in Govt. Savings Bank deposit as a trust deposit) for the performance of Sankarpane ~~XXXX~~ on the day of the annual Shraddha of Sri Bhaktavatsala Bhagavathar at the time

2)

Mr

appealing against the order no

May this be—

(i) printed?

(ii) treated as a standing order?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English Part?

(iv) translated?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press?

(vi) published in the Gazette, Kannada Part?

~~1) Check memorandum respecting~~ and requesting

~~order~~ that he may be allowed to keep the amount with him and carry out the wishes of Mrs. Ranjamma after furnishing proper security for the same.

confirm to be the executor of the will executed by Ranjamma and to issue the R/C read at the appln. and further directing him to carry out the wishes of the testatrix to be borne from the above.

2) Correspondence ending with letter No H.C. 98/36-35 dated 22-7-1936 from the M.C. ~~submitting his opinion~~ furnishing his opinion ~~recommending action~~ on the petn.

List of Enclosure

over no 308-2 Encl to M.C. 26-8-36

His report in file No 4.

Venkatarangiah has offered S. No. 247 (part) of Dabbaspalla Village measuring 7 a 9 guntas, assessed at Rs 29/- as shown in the sketch above for Rs 400/- as per his

Copied by

Examined by

ENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*

after consulting the Dharmadarsis of the temple